#### 1. Call to Order and Instructions

Rick Ramacier, *CCCTA*, Vice Chair of the Bay Area Partnership Board sat in for Chair, Suzanne Willford *SCTA*.

### 2. Discussion of Change to Meeting

Due to a schedule conflict on Suzanne Wilford's calendar a few dates have been chosen as alternatives. Alix Bockelman suggested meeting on August 11<sup>th</sup> or 21<sup>st</sup> and December 8<sup>th</sup> or 18<sup>th</sup>. An e-mail will be sent out to all Partnership Board members to set a future meeting date.

#### 3. Approval of Meeting Minutes of March 24, 2006

### 4. Transit Connectivity Financial Plan

Doug Kimsey, *MTC*, stated that the MTC Commission had adopted the Transit Connectivity Plan in April 2006. The Commission requested to include Real Time Transit and Transit Information displays at the three international airports along with the 21 hubs.

As a follow-up to a request made by the Partnership during the March meeting, the Transit Connectivity Financial Plan is being brought forth to the Partnership for further discussion. The estimates are still preliminary until field reviews of all 21 hubs are complete. MTC recommends that regional funds be directed to the 1) purchase and installation of way finding signage; 2) transit information display capital and on-going maintenance; and 3) Real-Time Display Capital and life cycle replacement. Regional costs will be funded through State Transit Assistance (STA) regional discretionary funding. This recommendation does not require a change to the STA policy and will allow MTC to honor existing commitments made through the STA regional Formula.

It is further recommended that individual transit properties be responsible for annual maintenance and life cycle replacement for way finding signage as well as annual maintenance for real-time displays.

Steve Castleberry, *WTA*, asked if MTC would charge the transit operators for getting their transit information into 511. Doug responded that the costs would be included in the maintenance costs.

Daryl Halls, *STA*, voiced some concern of the availability in the funding capital. Doug stated that the cost for the program would not exceed its budget.

A motion was made to move the program costs and the funding principles as presented and include capping the amount for the program.

The Partnership expressed interest in a future discussion on regional transit capital needs and priorities, with an objective of looking at all needs rather than just incremental needs that arise.

#### 5. Routine Accommodation for Pedestrians and Bicyclists

Doug Johnson, *MTC*, presented an update to the Routine Accommodation study. As a result of several discussions with courts and bicycle stakeholders, several changes were made: 1) the addition of a policy recommendation outlining the context for the recommendations such as the careful and thorough evaluation of the needs of bicyclists, pedestrians, and all disabled users during project planning, funding, design, construction, and maintenance while not replacing any locally adopted policies regarding transportation planning or design. 2) the requirement that 15 percent of each project budget be spent on Routine Accommodation has been removed, but cities and counties have been encouraged to adopt their own county policies. 3) the recommendations regarding the need for funding non-motorized facilities replaced due to construction that reduces non motorized access has been revised to address key issues; and 4) commitment to develop a pedestrian and bicycle accommodation checklist for regionally funded projects by the end of 2006 (with input from CMAs, Local Streets and Roads, Regional Pedestrian Committee, and the Regional Bicycle Working Group).

Rich Napier, *City and County Association of Governments of San Mateo*, expressed concern that policy at the regional level is unnecessary, and disagrees with policy number six, which states that bicycle and pedestrian money cannot be used to replace bicycle and pedestrian access which is eliminated by another project.

Maria Lombardo recommended a compromise to policy number six in which it would be decided on a case-by-case basis whether MTC would allow the use of funds in that circumstance.

Dennis Fay, *Alameda CMA*, said that he does not support the policy.

Bob McCleary, *CCTA*, mentioned that the CMAs did not feel that the goals and outcomes of the outgoing checklist were clear.

The Partnership commended Doug and his work on the Routine Accommodation. Doug will take the Partnership's recommendations into consideration prior to bringing the Routine Accommodation forward to the June Planning Committee on June 9<sup>th</sup> and the Commission meeting on June 28<sup>th</sup>.

## 6. Zero Emission Bus (ZEB) Requirements

Kate Miller, MTC, provided background on the California Air Resources Board (CARB) staff proposal for revising the ZEB regulations. She also provided background on existing ZEB demonstrations by the region's bus operators. The preliminary data suggests that ZEB technology is not ready for large-scale commercialization. In addition, hydrogen fuel cell capital and operating costs are significantly higher than diesel. The CARB proposal would delay implementation of the ZEB purchase requirement to allow for another ZEB demonstration to help further the technology. Under the proposal, transit operators on the diesel path with more than 200 buses would be required to perform a second-generation demonstration. Regionally, this would require each affected operator to procure three ZEB buses and related infrastructure. The cost of this is significant but could potentially delay the

Record of Meeting – Partnership Board: June 5, 2006 Page 3

ZEB purchase requirement, which ultimately would save the region millions of dollars. MTC staff is recommending that roughly \$15 million in regional STP or FTA funds be committed to help fund the demonstration project. The affected operators as well as the Transit Finance Working Group and the Partnership Technical Advisory Committee supported the MTC staff proposal. A general consensus to the funding proposal was reached by the Partnership.

# 7. Proposition 1B Overview

Randy Rentschler, *MTC*, summarized key issues in Proposition 1B, while Alix Bockelman, *MTC*, went over the program and implementation aspect. After reviewing the key issues with the Partnership and receiving their comments, the general consensus was to form discussion groups to discus policy priorities and procedures, especially for the Corridor Mobility program.

## 8. Transit Efficiency & Effectiveness: Report from Commission workshop

Steve Heminger, *MTC*, reported on the Commission workshop that took place on May 24 and 25, 2006. He thanked Mike Scanlon, Nat Ford, and Rick Fernandez who were active participants at the workshop, which focused on the general subject of Transit Efficiency and Effectiveness. The workshop covered four main areas: 1) STA funding, 2) Performance Measures and Performance Standards; 3) Service rationalization. 4) Institutional Consolidation.